## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CLERK US DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DIST. OF TX FILED

2019 DEC -4 AM R: 20

DEPUTY CLERK\_BMH

# COVER SHEET TO MOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD

RANCE MAGEE & MICHELLE MAGEE, ET AL.

5-19MC0017-H

PETITIONER(S)

COVER SHEET TO MOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD

MR. COOPER, ET AL.

ν.

RESPONDENT(S)

## **IDENTITY OF THE PARTIES**

- 1. Petitioners, Rance Magee and Michelle Magee are citizens of the State of Michigan, County of St. Clair with a residence located in Emmett, Michigan.
- 2. Respondent(s) are residents of the State of Texas, County of Dallas with their Corporate Headquarters located in Texas.

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 1. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 for reasons set forth below.
- 2. Petitioner is a citizen of the State of Michigan.
- 3. Respondent(s) are incorporated the State of Texas. There is a complete Diversity of Citizenship between Petitioner and Respondent(s).
- 4. Petitioner seeks to confirm an arbitration award of which exceeds \$ 75,000.00.

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

#### **MEMORANDUM OF LAW**

RANCE MAGEE & MICHELLE MAGEE, ET AL

PETITIONERS,

v.

MR. COOPER, ET AL.

RESPONDENT(S)

This memorandum is submitted on behalf of Petitioners Rance Magee & Michelle Magee in support of this motion, pursuant to 9 U.S.C. § 9, to confirm an arbitration award. this motion should be granted and the award confirmed into a judgment because the arbitration was in all respects proper and the award is final and legally binding upon all parties.

#### STATEMENT OF FACTS

On or about October 09, 2018; Petitioners Rance Magee & Michelle Magee and Respondent(s) entered into an agreement which provided that the parties would settle any dispute arising out of the agreement by arbitration according to Keisha Jones, Arbitrator.

### PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner filed an arbitration claim with SITCOMM Arbitration Association claiming \$558,406.00 in damages due to Petitioner. On January 17, 2019 the arbitrator issued Petitioner an award of \$558,406.00. Petitioner now moves to confirm this award.

### **EXPLANATION**

The Federal Arbitration Act, 9 U.S.C. § 9; provides that "within one year after the award is made any party to the arbitration may apply to the court so specified for an order confirming

the award and thereupon the court must grant such an order unless the award is vacated, modified, or corrected. Accordingly, the court has the obligation to confirm Petitioner's arbitration award into a judgment. See *Doctor's Assocs., Inc. v. Casarotto*, 116 s. Ct. 1652, 1657 (1996) (stating the purpose of the federal arbitration act is to ensure that private agreements to arbitration are enforced); *Allied Bruce Terminix Cos. v. Dobson*, 115 s. Ct. 834, 838 (1995) ("[t]he basic purpose of the federal arbitration act is to overcome courts' refusals to enforce agreements to arbitrate.") *Southland Corp. v. Keating*, 465 U.S. 1, 15-16 (1984) (holding the federal arbitration act preempts state law and state courts cannot apply state statutes that invalidate arbitration agreements).

The standard of review of an arbitrator's decision by the court is very narrow. The scope of review is limited and the court will not examine the validity of the decision except to the extent that the award exceeds the agreement of the parties. See *Burchell v. Marsh*, 58 U.S. 344, 349 (1854) (stating the appropriate scope of judicial review is whether the award is the honest decision of the arbitrator, made within the scope of the arbitrator's power, and that a court will not otherwise set aside an award for error, either in law or fact); *Coast Trading Co. v. Pacific* Molasses Co., 681 F 2d 1195, 1197-98 (9th Cir. 1982).

Accordingly, Justice Kavanaugh of the Supreme Court expressed his opinion as "We must interpret the act as written and the Act in turn requires that we interpret the contract as written. When the parties' contract delegates the arbitrability question to an arbitrator, a court may not override the contract. In those circumstances, a court possesses no power to decide the arbitrability issue. That is true even if the court thinks that the argument that the arbitration agreement applies to a particular dispute is wholly groundless."

Further, Kavanaugh continued; "That conclusion follows not only from the text of the Act but also from precedent. We have held that a court may not "rule on the potential merits of the underlying" claim that is assigned by contract to an arbitrator, "even if it appears to the court to be frivolous." A court has "no business weighing the merits of the grievance" because the "agreement is to submit all grievances to arbitration. Not merely those which the court will deem meritorious." AT&T Technologies principle applies with equal force to the threshold issue of arbitrability. Just as a court may not decide a merits question that the parties have delegated to an arbitrator.

Here, the arbitrator(s), having considered the pleadings and other evidence presented at the hearing, determined that each Respondent is liable to Petitioner for \$ 558,406.00 The arbitrator also determined that Respondent(s) have no past, present or future claim against Petitioner's property. There are no grounds for vacating, modifying, or correcting an arbitration award enumerated in 9 U.S.C. §§ 10-11 which exist and Respondent(s) have not made any motion to vacate, modify, or correct the award.

#### **CONCLUSION**

Petitioner respectfully requests an order confirming an arbitration award into a judgment for the amount of \$ 558,406.00 for Petitioner and against each Respondent and an order releasing Respondent(s) past, present and future claims against Petitioner's property and return any and all properties held in any manner.

Dated: November 22, 2019

Rance Magee, Femione

Michelle Magee, Petitioner

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Rance Magee, being at or above the age of 18, of the majority a citizen of the United States of America, did mail the documents entitled:

Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award Memorandum of Law Civil Cover Sheet Arbitration Award Contracts

by placing them in an envelope addressed to: Name and address:

United States District Court For the Northern District of Texas George Mahon Federal Building 1205 Texas Ave., Rm 306 Lubbock, TX 79401-4002

Mr. Cooper 8950 Cyprus Waters Blvd Coppell, Texas 75019

GMAC Mortgage 100 Witmer Road Horsham, PA 19044

Nationstar Mortgage 8950 Cyprus Waters Blvd Coppell, TX 75019 Ocwen Financial 1661 Worthington Road, Ste 100 West Palm Beach, FL 33409

Fannie Mae 1100 15th Street N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005

Affixing the proper postage and depositing it with the local postal carrier, also being of the age of the majority, and not a party to this action who upon receipt guarantees delivery as addressed and/or local drop box guaranteeing the same as prescribed in law. If called upon I provide this sworn testimony based on first-hand knowledge of the aforementioned events attesting and ascribing to these facts on this day November 22, 2019.

Rance Magee

JS 44 (Rev. 02/19)

Case 5:19-mc-00017-H Document 1 Filed 12/04/19 Page 6 of 7 PageID 6

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS  Rance & Michelle Magee, Et Al.  (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff  (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)  (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)				DEFENDANTS  Mr. Cooper, Et Al.  County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Dallas  (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.											
										Attorneys (If Known)					
										II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in C	One Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA
				□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government			rf def	Incorporated or Pri		or Defenda PTF □ 4	DEF			
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	3 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citize	Citizen of Another State					□ 5						
		_		en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗖 3	Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6						
IV. NATURE OF SUIT						here for: Nature o									
CONTRACT  ☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY  ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJUR'  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability  PERSONAL PROPER  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending  380 Other Personal Property Damage  385 Property Damage  385 Property Damage  385 Property Damage  536 Alien Detainee  510 Motions to Vacate Sentence  530 General  535 Death Penalty Other:  340 Mandamus & Other  550 Civil Rights  555 Prison Condition  560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	Y	DEFEITURE/PENALTY  5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881  0 Other  LABOR  0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Employee Retirement Income Security Act  IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application 5 Other Immigration Actions	422 Appe	RTY RIGHTS rights  at t - Abbreviated Drug Application emark SECURITY (1395ff) Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 405(g))  AL TAX SUITS s (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	□ 375 False Cl □ 376 Qui Tan 3729(a) □ 400 State Re □ 410 Antitrus □ 430 Banks a □ 450 Comme □ 470 Rackete Corrupt □ 470 Rackete Vorupt □ 480 Consum □ 485 Telepho Protecti □ 490 Cable/S □ 850 Securiti Exchan □ 890 Other St □ 891 Agricult □ 893 Environ □ 895 Freedon Act  ■ 896 Arbitrat □ 899 Adminis Act/Rev	n (31 USC)  apportionnt t nd Banking ree tion er Influenc Organizati er Credit ne Consum on Act at TV es/Common ge aututory Act ural Acts mental Ma n of Inform ion strative Pro iew or App Decision tionality oi	ment g ced and ions mer dities/ tions atters nation coccdure						
	moved from	Appellate Court				6 Multidistri Litigation Transfer	-	Multidis Litigatio Direct Fil	n -						
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of ca														
VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.			<del>-</del>	DEMAND S CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:  JURY DEMAND:  Yes X No											
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE		-	DOCKE	T NUMBER									
DATE	- <u> </u>	SIGNATURE OF ATT	FORNEY C	OF RECORD											
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY															
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG JUD	GF								



EP14F Oct 2018 OD: 12 1/2 x 9 1/2

